

## REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on March 4, 2008. The pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1 and 24 are amended. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

### Claims 1-23:

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection of independent claim 1 for at least two reasons. First, none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed method step of “terminating the first GPRS MM context while the mobile device is in a non-communicative state.” The Office Action incorrectly concludes that this claim limitation is taught by the Madour reference at column 6, lines 1-4. Specifically, the Office Action suggests that when the mobile device in Madour roams from a first network to a second network, it is in a “non-communicative state” with respect to the first network. The Applicant submits that this is an unreasonable interpretation of the claim term “non-communicative state,” which clearly means that the mobile device is not communicating with any network. Nonetheless, claims 1 and 24 have been amended to make this intended meaning absolutely clear.

In addition, the rejection of claim 1 is further defective because none of the cited references teach or suggest the claimed step of deleting the first set of data associated with the first GPRS MM context, wherein the first set of data includes one or more information transfer data frames that include user data, the user data including at least one of email data, calendar data, voice mail data, and task item data. The Office Action concludes that these limitations are taught by the combination of the Sinnarajah and Darby references. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Sinnarajah reference describes a technique for reducing call setup latency. More specifically, Sinnarajah teaches at column 11 that service configuration data for a previous call may be stored and reused to setup a new call, with the stored configuration data being deleted only after a new service negotiation begins. The Darby reference describes a network configuration between a workstation and a server in which email retrieval codes are deleted after the workstation disconnects from the server so that the codes cannot be reused to illicitly retrieve another person's email. (See, Darby, column 4, lines 8-16.) Significantly, neither of these references disclose or suggest deleting queued email data, calendar data, voice mail data or task item data. At best, Darby discloses deleting configuration information that is used to retrieve email data. Similarly, Sinnarajah discloses deleting expired configuration data. Accordingly, there is nothing in any of the cited references that would lead the person skilled in the art to the claimed method and the rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Claims 24-40:

Independent claim 24 is rejected over the same references as independent claim 1. Claim 24 recites the method steps of terminating the first PDP context while the mobile device is in a non-communicative state, and deleting the first set of data associated with the first PDP context, wherein the first set of data includes one or more information transfer data frames that include user data, the user data including at least one of email data, calendar data, voice mail data, and task item data. The Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least these limitations for the reasons stated above with respect to the similar limitations in claim 1. Claim 24 and its dependent claims are therefore patentable over the cited references and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.

Claims 41-50:

Independent claim 41 is also rejected over the same references as independent claim 1. Claim 41 recites the method step of deleting from the mobile device the queued data relating to the first communication link, wherein the data includes one or more information transfer data frames that include user data, the user data including at least one of email data, calendar data, voice mail data, and task item data. The Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least these limitations for the reasons stated above with respect to the similar limitations in claim 1. Claim 41 and its dependent claims are therefore patentable over the cited references and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.

Claims 51-56:

Independent claim 51 is a system claim that recites executable network management program code that performs the method of claim 41 when executed. Claim 51 and its dependent claims are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 41.

Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the cited reference and in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

  
Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)  
Jones Day  
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7506